

REMARKS

Claims 15-19, 23, 25-28 and 30-44 are pending in this application. The Office Action rejects claims 12-14, 21-22, 26-28 and 30-31 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; and rejects claims 1-11, 15-20, 23, 25 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). By this Amendment, claims 15-16, 23, 25-28 and 30-31 are amended; claims 1-14, 20-22 and 29 are cancelled; and new claims 32-44 are added. Support for the amendments to claims 26-28 and 30-31 may be found in the present specification at, for example, examples 1-47 shown on pages 10-11. Support for new claims 32-44 may be found in original claims 15-19, 23 and 25. No new matter is added.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Parvini at the interview held July 15, 2008, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for noting that claims 12-14, 21-22, 26-28 and 30-31 contain allowable subject matter (aside from the §112 rejection for claims 26-28 and 30-31). As discussed during the interview, Applicants note that although page 12 of the Office Action states that claims "31-32 would be allowable" this phrase should have referred to claims 30-31 as no claim 32 was pending at the time the Office Action was issued.

Applicants further submit that otherwise allowable claims 26-28 and 30-31 are amended merely to *clarify* the nature of the compounds recited therein, as discussed below. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 26-28 and 30-31 remain allowable for the reasons indicated in the Office Action at page 12.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claims 12-14, 21-22, 26-28 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Specifically, the claims are allegedly indefinite because the phrase "cesium halide" is broader in scope than what "X" refers to in the formula "MX."

Without admitting the propriety of the rejection, and in the interest of advancing prosecution, claims 26-28 and 30-31 are amended to recite "CsX" instead of "cesium halide." Support for these amendments may be found in the present specification at, for example, examples 1-47 shown on pages 10-11. Claims 12-14 and 21-22 are cancelled.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Rejections over Aitken '609

Claims 1-11, 15, 20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been obvious over Aitken (U.S. Patent No. 7,143,609) (hereinafter "Aitken '609"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

By this Amendment, claims 1-11 and 20 are cancelled, and claims 15 and 25 are amended to be dependent on non-reject claim 26. Accordingly, the rejection is moot.

Claims 16-19, 23 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been obvious over Aitken '609 in view of Kuo (U.S. Patent No. 5,958,545). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

By this Amendment, claim 16-19 are amended to be ultimately dependent on non-rejected claim 26, claim 23 is amended to be dependent on non-rejected claim 30, and claim 29 is cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection is moot.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection over Cole

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 8-9, 15 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been obvious over Cole (U.S. Patent No. 6,128,429). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 4-7, 8-9 and 20 are cancelled, and claim 15 is amended to be dependent on non-rejected claim 26. Accordingly, the rejection is moot.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

V. Rejection over Aitken '584

Claims 1-2 and 4-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as having been obvious over Aitken (U.S. Patent No. 5,389,584). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

By this Amendment, claims 1-2 and 4-11 are cancelled. Accordingly, the rejection is moot.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



William P. Berridge
Registration No. 30,024

Samuel T. Dangremond
Registration No. 60,466

WPB:STD/emd

Enclosure:
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: October 10, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--